



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

the whole coterie of enthusiasts mentioned by Suetonius, and at the same time we can perceive a motive for the composition of the spurious verses.

It is quite possible that from the corruption of the text in Suetonius or in these pseudo-Horatian lines, *Lenius* was accepted as the spelling of the friend of Lucilius, and *Silius* came into existence from a misreading of *Laelius* (*Lelius*). Such an hypothesis would readily explain the otherwise unsupported statement of Schol. Vallae *ad Juv.* i. 20: "Magnus Auruncae alumnus," where besides Lucilius, "vel Lenium dicit qui et ipse satyras scripsit vel Silium et ipsum sui temporis satyricum, qui omnes ex Aurunca fuerunt." Casaubon (*De Satyrica Graecorum Poesia et Romanorum Satira*, Lib. II, p. 298) observes: "an scribendum Lenaeum? estne hic ille Sitararum poeta quem antea commemoravimus? nominatur ibidem et Silius quidam, qui non est Silius Italicus" (cf. Teuffel §332. 9).

GEORGE DWIGHT KELLOGG

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

In the January issue of the *Classical Journal* Professor John Greene makes certain remarks upon my definition of ictus in Latin poetry. While I entertain no unwillingness to have my views on this or any other topic made the subject of discussion, and should take no occasion to complain in case they were condemned after candid examination, yet I must take exception when, as in the case of the article referred to, my views are misrepresented. My general position is this: If a writer is not familiar with the views he undertakes to discuss, he has not the right to discuss them—the moral right, I mean. If he *is* familiar with them, he has no right to represent their author as saying what he does not say, or as remaining silent on material points where he has been clear and explicit. Let me be specific.

On p. 117, Professor Greene quotes from my *Latin Grammar* as follows: "In every foot the long syllable naturally receives the greater prominence. This prominence is called ictus." It is not of great importance, perhaps, that this quotation is made from the first edition of my *Latin Grammar*, which has been out of print for a year, and that the revised edition (March, 1908) has a more precise formulation of the definition as follows (366, 5): "In every fundamental foot (these are defined in 366, 2, as the trochee, iambus, dactyl, and anapaest) the long syllable naturally receives the greater prominence. This prominence is called ictus."¹

¹ This more precise definition has also stood for years in my *Horace*, in my *Teaching of Latin*, p. 181, and in my *Virgil*.

Professor Greene continues: "What of the spondee, not mentioned, by the way, among the most important kinds of feet? The only important kinds, it seems, are those which this new rule can be made to fit." If Professor Greene has read my article in the *American Journal of Philology* XIX. 361 ff. he must know that I have discussed at length the objection he raises. On p. 380 of that article I say:¹

Professor Hale first objects that my definition of ictus as "the quantitative prominence inherent in a long syllable" will not hold, because it will not apply to the second long syllable of the spondee when the spondee is substituted for the dactyl in dactylic verse. But the second long of the spondee in such case is *not* quantitatively prominent. As already pointed out above, the spondee is not a fundamental foot; when it is used as a substitute for the dactyl, it naturally takes on in consciousness the dactylic character, i. e., the quantitative prominence is felt in consciousness as resting on the first syllable. The second long of the spondee is just as naturally felt to be not-prominent, because it is felt in consciousness as corresponding to the two shorts of the dactyl, which are not quantitatively prominent. In defining ictus as the quantitative prominence inherent in *the* long syllable of *fundamental feet*, I by no means say or imply that every long syllable is quantitatively prominent. The situation is precisely the same in English verse. There we define ictus as the accentual prominence inherent in a stressed syllable. Yet not every stressed syllable is accentually prominent in English verse. In English iambic measures the foot often consists of two stressed syllables; yet the first of these is not felt as accentually prominent, simply because the verse has enough pure iambs to gain a distinct iambic character (˘ –) and an occasional spondee (– –) is naturally felt as prominent only in the second accented syllable.

Professor Greene may or may not accept my conclusions, but that is not the point. The point is that I have *given consideration* to this question, while Professor Greene in discussing my position seems either ignorant of what I have written on the subject or else guilty of a *suppressio veri*, in that, knowing my views, he allows his readers to believe that I have ignored the difficulty he mentions.

Professor Greene continues: "In the light of such a definition, how is the learner to comprehend the meter of such a line as (Horace) i. 21. 2: 'In tonsum, pueri, dicite Cynthium? . . . ' *Intonsum* must have an ictus on each syllable." Here again Professor Greene is either ignorant of what I really say, or suppresses my actual view. I have nowhere said that I regard – – as a fundamental foot, or that every long syllable has quantitative prominence. In fact, as already pointed out, I have explicitly disclaimed any such view.

¹ See also my *Quantitative Reading of Latin Poetry*, p. 3, where the "ictus" of the spondee is explained.

While perfectly ready to admit that my views are not set forth in detail in my *Latin Grammar*, yet I must urge that the question which Professor Greene is discussing is not the adequacy of my *Grammar*, either for the study of Horace's lyric meters or for any other purpose, but the soundness of my conception of ictus. Since this is so, and since in my *Grammar* I expressly disclaim any purpose of giving guidance in the matter of reading lyric meter, I feel justified in expecting that any one who discusses my position on the subject of ictus should discuss it in the light of all I have written on the subject, and not merely in the light of a brief statement (necessarily dogmatic) contained in a book for some time out of print.

Professor Greene concludes: "Well, this is progress; it is always useful to discover the uselessness of any alleged principle." Progress! One of the most delicate and difficult of all the problems of Latin philology is thus dismissed, without any discussion of the arguments which have been raised in defense of my theory of ictus—even without any intimation that I have ever adduced any arguments. Not a word of reference to what Madvig has said; not a word of reference to the new arguments brought forward by Gerhard Schultz; not a word of reference to the keen observations of Kaucinszki. Thirty-nine lines of misrepresentation and suppression, and the job is done!

May I say in conclusion that in classical philology, as in everything else, our only safe refuge is in truth, and that not only is no progress made, but great harm is done by the perversion or suppression of facts?

CHARLES E. BENNETT

ITHACA, N. Y.
January 31, 1909